

7th February 1925]

COMMITTEE TO INQUIRE INTO EXISTENCE OF CORRUPTION AMONGST
SUBORDINATE GOVERNMENT OFFICIALS.

Mr. K. KOTI REDDI :—“ The resolution that stands in my name runs as follows :—

‘ That this Council recommends to the Government to appoint a committee of officials and non-officials to enquire into and suggest measures to put an end to the existence of corruption amongst the subordinate Government officials ’.

“ I formally move the resolution.”

Mr. T. ADINARAYANA CHETTIYAR :—“ I second it.”

* Rao Bahadur T. A. RAMALINGA CHETTIYAR :—“ I move that the further consideration of this motion be adjourned to the next non-official day available for non-official business.”

Rao Bahadur C. NATESA MUDALIYAR :—“ I second it.”

The motion was put to the House and carried.

Mr. Koti Reddi's resolution was accordingly adjourned to the next non-official day.

COMMUNAL REPRESENTATION IN GOVERNMENT SERVICE.

* Rao Bahadur C. NATESA MUDALIYAR :—“ The resolution that stands in my name runs as follows :—

‘ That this Council recommends to the Government that at least 40 per cent of posts in both the “ lower ” and “ upper ” grades of the services under Government be reserved to the non-Brahman Hindus, 10 per cent to the depressed classes, 15 per cent to the Muhammadans, 10 per cent to the Indian Christians, 10 per cent to the Brahmans, the rest for the representation of other communities and for recruitment by competitive examination.’

“ Sir, in our country, where the population consists of caste-tight, community-tight and race-tight compartments, where members of one community and those of another have nothing in common except colour and the country to which they belong, where there is as much difference between the members of one community and those of another community as there is between them and any other people from any land who may settle in our country. Communal differences are inevitable and communal adjustment is a necessity. The problem of communal representation has been engaging the attention of the Government even three-quarters of a century ago and in the Board's proceedings of 1854 it is stated that

‘ The Collectors should be able to see that the subordinate appointments in their districts are not monopolized by the members of a few influential families. Endeavour should always be made to divide the principal appointments in each district among the several castes. A proportion of tahsildars in each district should belong to castes other than the Brahman and it should be a standing rule that the two chief revenue servants in the Collector's office should be of different castes.’

“ That was the Board's proceedings of 1854 but evidently the Board's proceedings were not obeyed by the Board's subordinates as it is now the case that Government Orders are not obeyed by the Government servants. In 1911, a note was added that the ‘ last rule should be applied to the persons actually doing duty as huzur sarishtadar and head clerk and not to the persons who on paper hold those appointments ’.